

**MINUTES FOR THE COURT OF APPEAL
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT**

September 14, 2006

DIVISION TWO

B179005 American International Specialty Lines Ins. Co.
 v.
 Continental Casualty Ins. Co.

Filed order certifying opinion for publication.

DIVISION THREE

B181185 Morris Shemian et al (Not for Publication)
 v.
 Shahram Afshani and CDMA California Partners

We affirm the trial court orders (1) granting plaintiffs' motion to vacate the judgment (and other orders), and (2) denying defendants' motion for reconsideration. Plaintiffs are to recover costs on appeal.

Kitching, J.

We concur: Croskey, Acting P.J.
 Aldrich, J.

B189833 People (Not for Publication)
 v.
 Bryant Giovanni Sanchez

The judgment is affirmed.

Klein, P.J.

We concur: Kitching, J.
 Aldrich, J.

DIVISION THREE (Continued)

B183713 Abigail Hernandez et al (Certified for Publication)
v.
Hillsides, Inc. et al

The judgment is reversed. The matter is remanded with directions to vacate the order granting the motion for summary judgment and enter a new and different order denying the motion for summary judgment and granting summary adjudication of plaintiffs' causes of action for intentional infliction of emotional distress and negligent infliction of emotional distress. The trial court shall then conduct such further proceedings as are appropriate in a manner not inconsistent with the views express herein. Plaintiffs shall recover their costs on appeal.

Croskey, Acting P.J.

We concur: Kitching, J.
 Aldrich, J.

DIVISION FIVE

B186382 Dakota Carroll et al (Not for Publication)
v.
Princess Cruise Lines, Ltd dba Princess Cruises

The judgment is affirmed. Respondent(s) to recover costs.

Armstrong, Acting P.J.

We concur: Mosk, J.
 Kriegler, J.

DIVISION SIX

Court convened at 1:30 P.M.

Present: Gilbert, P.J., Yegan, J., Coffee, J., Perren, J., P. McGill, Chief Deputy Clerk and G. Bents, Senior Deputy Clerk.

DIVISION SIX (Continued)

Each of the following:

B185592 People v. Carrion
B186550 People v. Bahr
B187916 People v. Smith

Argument continued to October, 2006.

Each of the following:

B182366 People v. Marr
B183783 People v. Bauer
B184115 People v. Collins
B184387 People v. Licea
B184544 People v. Gonzalez
B185372 People v. Altman
B185546 People v. Boardman
B185620 People v. Murray
B185723 People v. Gallegos
B186579 People v. Norwood
B187373 People v. Lopez
B187901 People v. Dombrowski
B189340 People v. Jimenez Sauza

Argument waived, cause submitted.

B185496 People
 v.
 Gil

Merits:

Argued by Michael C. McMahon, Chief Public Defender, for appellant and argument previously waived by respondent. Cause submitted.

DIVISION SIX (Continued)

B182741 People
 v.
 Waterloo

Merits:

Argued by Rudy G. Kraft for appellant and by Herbert S. Tetef, Deputy Attorney General, for respondent via video conference. Cause submitted.

B184708 People
 v.
 Baldivia

Merits:

Argued by Larry S. Dushkes for appellant and by Katherine Okawa Kohm, Deputy Attorney General, for respondent via video conference. Cause submitted.

B182712 People
 v.
 Valentine

Merits:

Argued by Larry S. Dushkes for appellant and by Jonathan J. Kline, Deputy Attorney General, for respondent via video conference. Cause submitted.

B183190 People
 v.
 Ordonez

Merits:

Argued by Larry S. Dushkes for appellant and by Tasha G. Timbadia, Deputy Attorney General, for respondent via video conference. Cause submitted.

DIVISION SIX (Continued)

B186798 People
 v.
 Tartaglione

Merits:
Argued by Rudy G. Kraft for appellant and by Robert F. Katz, Deputy Attorney General, for respondent via video conference. Cause submitted.

B185962 People
 v.
 Moore

Merits:
Argued by Jean F. Matulis for appellant and by Robert F. Katz, Deputy Attorney General, for respondent via video conference. Cause submitted.

B187027 People
 v.
 Trebas

Merits:
Argued by Rudy G. Kraft for appellant and by Marc E. Turchin, Deputy Attorney General, for respondent via video conference. Cause submitted.

B186197 People
 v.
 Horner

Merits:
Argued by Richard Eric Holly for appellant and by Marc E. Turchin, Deputy Attorney General, for respondent via video conference. Cause submitted.

DIVISION SIX (Continued)

B185095 People
 v.
 Winfield

Merits:

Argued by Richard Eric Holly for appellant and by Kathy Pomerantz, Deputy Attorney General, for respondent via video conference. Cause submitted.

Coffee, J. left the bench.

B187029 People
 v.
 Hannibal

Merits:

Argued by Rudy G. Kraft for appellant and by Tasha G. Timbadia, Deputy Attorney General, for respondent via video conference. Cause submitted.

Court adjourned.

DIVISION SEVEN

B182004 People
 v.
 Serrano

Filed order denying petition for rehearing.

DIVISION EIGHT

B183576 People (Not for Publication)
v.
Maria

The judgment is affirmed.

Flier, J.

We concur: Cooper, P.J.
Rubin, J.

B192774 Keefe (Not for Publication)
v.
Superior Court, Los Angeles County
(City Of Los Angeles Police Department et al., r.p.i.)

We followed the procedures and gave the notice described in *Palma v. U.S. Industrial Fasteners, Inc.* (1984) 36 Cal.3d 171, at pages 177-183. No factual issues are disputed, the legal error is clear, and the matter should be expedited. Accordingly, a peremptory writ in the first instance is appropriate. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1088; *Alexander v. Superior Court* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 1218, 1222-1223; *Ng v. Superior Court* (1992) 4 Cal.4th 29, 35.) Keefe's petition is granted with regard to those categories of documents we describe below. Let a peremptory writ of mandate issue directing the respondent superior court to vacate its order of July 19, 2006, denying *Pitchess* discovery as to Officers Brown and Reyes, and instead (2) issue a new order granting the motion as to these officers with respect to information concerning fabrication of charges, evidence or probable cause, false arrests, perjury, dishonesty, writing false police reports, false or misleading internal reports, or evidence of misconduct amounting to moral turpitude.

Cooper, P.J.

We concur: Boland, J.
Flier, J.

September 14, 2006 (Continued)

DIVISION EIGHT (Continued)

B180134 Camacho (Certified for Partial Publication)

v.

Automobile Club of Southern California et al.,
Bell Corporation of America

The order denying Exchange's motion to strike the complaint under Code of Civil Procedure section 425.16 and the judgment are affirmed. The parties are to bear their own costs on appeal.

Flier, J.

We concur: Rubin, Acting P.J.
Boland, J.